DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 069 IR 002 369

AUTHOR Kingsbury, Mary E.
TITLE The Future of School Library Media Centers.
PUB DATE Jul 75
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the American Library Association Annual Conference (94th, San Francisco, California, June 29 through July 5, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Audiovisual Programs; *Futures (of Society); *Instructional Materials Centers; Librarians; Library Research; Library Role; Library Surveys; Media Research; Media Specialists; *Media Technology; Questionnaires; *School Libraries; Speeches; Statistical Data; Tables (Data); *Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS ALA 75; *Delphi Technique

ABSTRACT

Since the future role played by the school library media center is important to library planners, a Delphi survey questioned school librarians, leaders in the profession, and faculty members in schools with media. Four factors were seen to affect the future of the media center: (1) trends within the next 25 years, (2) innovations needing to be introduced in the future, (3) trends rated in terms of desirability and (4) differences in ratings by the three groups. In general, practicing librarians, officers, and professors agree in their assessment of the desirability of each new trend and innovation but stress that library schools will have to provide a more media-oriented course of studies if they are to effectively meet the future deadline presented by this study. Statistical tables are provided. (Author/DS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Mary E. Kingsbury
Assistant Professor of
Library Science and
Research Associate in the
Institute for Research in
Social Science
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C. 27514

The Future of School Library Media Centers

The school library media specialist is by necessity an administrator who must assume all the obligations of that role. One of the most important as well as most challenging concerns planning defined by Elizabeth Stone as "that part of the management process which sets the objectives of administrative action in the future" [1, p.36]. A complex process, it requires the planner to exercise analytical powers over an unbounded time period and to project plans into an uncertain future. Daniel Bell in his recent venture in social forecasting notes that although the margin for error increases the further ahead one projects "at crucial points...trends become subject to choice...and the decision (to accelerate, swerve or deflect trends) is a policy intervention which may create a turning point in the history...of an institution" [2,p.4].

The assumption that trends are subject to the choices and decisions made by those concerned with school library media centers underlies this study. The last quarter of the twentieth century may very well be one of those turning points mentioned by Bell. In any event, knowing what trends and innovations members of the profession foresee for that period should enhance the efforts of planners.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is, therefore, to determine the trends considered likely and the innovations considered desirable in school library media centers of the future as identified by three groups, namely: practicing librarians who are members of the American Association of School Librarians; leaders of the

IR002369

profession, in this case officers and committee members of AASL who are not library educators; and faculty members in ALA accredited library schools who have an expressed interest in library media centers.

The study concentrates on four questions:

1. What trends do members of these groups forecast as likely to be present in school library media centers during the next twenty-five years?
2. What innovations would they like to see introduced in the future?
3. How do they rate these trends and innovations in terms of desirability and probable date when they will become common practice?
4. Do the three groups differ significantly in their ratings of the trends and innovations?

Design and Procedures of the Study

The research design for this study is an exploratory design directed at identifying trends and innovations rather that causal relationships. A modification of the Delphi technique developed by Olaf Helmer [3] was used to generate data. As the name Delphi suggests, making judgments about the future is a major element of the process in which the goal is to collect opinions about probabilities in terms of such variables as desirability and time.

The Delphi technique generally uses a series of three or, in some cases, four questionnaires. The first asks each respondent to contribute some information on the topic under investigation. Each respondent in this study was asked to identify one or two trends (desirable or undesirable) he thought likely to be present in media centers over the next twenty-five years and one or two innovations he would like to see introduced in the future. The second questionnaire consists of items developed from first-round responses and requests judgments in the form of priority ratings for each item. Participants

in this investigation evaluate each of the twenty-eight trends and twenty-nine innovations distilled from the first-round responses as to priority (desirability) and probable date of occurrence. The present study omits the additional rounds in which each respondent is provided with an average of previous round responses and is asked to reconsider his own response and either move to the group judgment or express a reason for his minority position. Such "forcing to consensus" is unnecessary for purposes of this study. This modification of the Delphi technique provides data about the future of library media centers without reliance on a single expert or on a discussion type of format in which such factors as reputation, personality, or rhetoric may influence decision making.

The three respondent groups for this study include a random sample of 132 practitioners listed in the ALA Directory as being members of AASL, 158 leaders of the profession listed in the ALA Organization Handbook as being officers and committee members (excluding professors) of AASL, and 80 professors whose teaching interests as described in the Association of American Library Schools Directory include school library organization and administration for a total of 370 [4]. Thirty-five percent (130) returned first-round questionnaires indicating the trends and innovations they anticipate for the future. The second questionnaire containing the fifty-seven items generated from the first-round replies was sent to all members of the original group with the exception of six who had asked to be excluded. Fifty-three practitioners, seventy-five officers, and thirty-one professors or a total of forty-four percent returned second-round questionnaires on which they rate items in terms of desirability and probable date of occurrence. Forty-one percent of the questionnaires were returned in time to be tabulated in the results.

Findings--Trends

Examination of the data in Table 1 reveals that practitioners, officers, and professors generally agree in their assessment of the desirability of each trend. Because the size of the total respondent group exceeds the number of items, a Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric analysis of variance by ranks could be applied to each item [5]. Results indicate that the three groups differ significantly in only four cases. Comparing the statistic H for trends 13, 16, 23, and 24 to the critical values for chi-square of 5.9 (.05 level) and 9.2 (.01 level) shows a clear rejection at the .05 level of the assumption of no significant difference in rankings. Ratings of each group displayed in Tables 2, 3, and 4 disclose, for example, that the officers and professors consider the media centers's becoming an open facility replacing the classroom as the learning center of the school a more desirable trend (11th place) than do the practitioners (17th place).

As evident in Table 1, the three groups also differ significantly in their estimation of the probable date of occurrence for trends 3, 4, 11, 18, and 23. Respondents fail to give a rating for probable date of occurrence much more frequently than for priority. A number comment that they find it nearly impossible to designate a probable date of occurrence. Unlike Montaigne, they can not by considering the present state of things "certainly conclude as to to future."

Officers and practitioners, the two groups closest to media centers, agree completely in their last five rankings and include identical items in their top five rankings but in different order. As might be expected, they are also in closer agreement on three of the four trends about which the groups differ significantly. The one exception is trend 13 mentioned above. Practitioners and officers, for example, appear much less enthusiastic than professors about a trend toward performing services for users rather than teaching them to be

TABLE 1

TRENDS RANKED ACCORDING TO PRIORITY BY THE MEAN FOR ALL GROUPS COMBINED

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
1	School library media facilities will be planned in consul with media specialists.	1 79.5 2 11.9 3 2.6 4 0.7 5 5.3	1.404	0.988	0.7719	'75 47.7 '80 27.2 '85 15.9 '90 6.0 '95 1.3 nr 2.0	1.838	0.997	4.3767
2	School librarians will be trained as both media specialists and curriculum consultants prepared to work with teachers in instructional planning and design.	1 72.8 2 17.2 3 3.3 4 1.3 5 5.3	1.490	1.019	2.6002	'75 27.8 '80 35.1 '85 23.2 '90 6.6 '95 4.0 nr 3.3	2.212	1.065	3.5765
3	Increased cooperation between school and public libraries.	1 62.9 2 22.5 3 10.6 4 -- 5 3.3 nr 0.7	1.573	0.929	1.3198	'75 46.4 '80 32.5 '85 9.3 '90 1.3 '95 4.0 nr 6.6	1.759	0.992	8.4695*
4	Greater emphasis on materials and equipment designed for individualized learning.	1 61.6 2 20.5 3 10.6 4 3.3 5 2.0 nr 2.0	1.608	0.952	2.7904	'75 51.7 '80 21.2 '85 9.9 '90 5.3 '95 3.3 nr 8.6	1.768	1.089	6.5909*
5	Greater cooperation between schools in a system, i.e., union catalogs, interlibrary loans, staff exchange, traveling storytellers, graphic artists.	1 60.9 2 20.5 3 13.2 4 -- 5 3.3 nr 2.0	1.615	0.958	2.299[illegible]	'75 33.8 '80 35.8 '85 17.9 '90 3.3 '95 3.3 nr 6.0	2.007	1.007	1.9602

TABLE 1 - Continued

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
6	Networking between school media centers and other library systems (academic, public, special, district, state, and regional).	1 50.3 2 19.2 3 20.5 4 4.6 5 3.3 nr 2.0	1.892	1.101	1.7475	'75 19.9 '80 27.8 '85 23.8 '90 13.9 '95 7.9 nr 6.6	2.596	1.219	3.9718
7	Accountability: justification for monies requested in terms of behavioral and educational objectives.	1 45.7 2 23.2 3 18.5 4 3.3 5 6.0 nr 3.3	1.973	1.168	5.8493	'75 46.4 '80 21.2 '85 15.9 '90 2.6 '95 2.0 nr 11.9	1.782	0.995	4.0439
8	Increased use of materials produced locally by students, teachers, and media specialists.	1 42.4 2 26.5 3 17.2 4 5.3 5 6.6 nr 2.0	2.054	1.200	3.6987	'75 35.8 '80 29.8 '85 15.9 '90 5.3 '95 4.0 nr 9.3	2.029	1.098	4.7808
9	School libraries will become media centers with total integration (intershelving) of print and non-print materials.	1 46.4 2 17.2 3 21.9 4 4.0 5 10.6	2.152	1.335	1.4384	'75 29.8 '80 27.8 '85 19.2 '90 6.0 '95 9.9 nr 7.3	2.336	1.284	0.7310
10	Greater use of differentiated staffing with the library media specialist functioning in an administrative capacity at the school or district level.	1 40.4 2 30.5 3 9.9 4 7.9 5 9.9 nr 1.3	2.154	1.314	3.0119	'75 17.2 '80 31.8 '85 21.9 '90 7.3 '95 11.9 nr 9.9	2.610	1.260	3.3969
11	Expanded utilization of closed circuit TV, cable TV, video tape systems.	1 37.1 2 24.5 3 25.8	2.168	1.159	1.0126	'75 27.2 '80 30.5 '85 23.2	2.226	1.098	8.2056*

TABLE 1 - Continued

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
		4 6.0 5 5.3 nr 1.3				'90 5.3 '95 4.6 nr 9.3			
12	Increased use of microforms.	1 34.4 2 26.5 3 25.8 4 5.3 5 5.3 nr 2.6	2.184	1.141	2.1100	'75 28.5 '80 29.1 '85 16.6 '90 7.9 '95 7.3 nr 10.6	2.289	1.233	4.9133
13	The school library media center will serve primarily as an "open" facility replacing the classroom as the learning center in the school.	1 33.1 2 24.5 3 25.2 4 8.6 5 7.3 nr 1.3	2.315	1.231	8.8121*	'75 10.6 '80 25.8 '85 19.2 '90 13.2 '95 23.2 nr 7.9	3.137	1.374	4.1025
14	Re-emphasis on books and reading (multiple copies, paperbacks); non-print materials important, but less so.	1 31.1 2 21.9 3 23.8 4 12.6 5 6.6 nr 4.0	2.393	1.254	2.4244	'75 24.5 '80 20.5 '85 19.2 '90 5.3 '95 11.3 nr 19.2	2.484	1.356	5.7808
15	Increased use of technology: computerized cataloging, computer-generated bibliographies and individualized learning packages, dial access systems, data retrieval systems--local and regional; electronic hookups between homes and schools.	1 29.1 2 29.8 3 17.9 4 11.9 5 9.3 nr 2.0	2.412	1.288	4.5389	'75 6.0 '80 17.2 '85 31.1 '90 18.5 '95 17.2 nr 9.9	3.265	1.169	5.1456
16	All children's services (public and school) provided within	1 31.8 2 14.6	2.711	1.504	6.6572*	'75 11.9 '80 25.2	2.845	1.253	5.5208

TABLE 1 - Continued

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
	school media centers open the year around.	3 21.9 4 11.3 5 19.2 nr 1.3				'85 25.8 '90 9.3 '95 13.2 nr 14.6			
17	Schools and their media centers will become community centers providing young and old with both educational and recreational facilities the year around.	1 26.5 2 15.9 3 27.8 4 13.2 5 13.9 nr 2.6	2.714	1.375	3.6570	'75 9.3 '80 20.5 '85 29.1 '90 11.3 '95 16.6 nr 13.2	3.061	1.251	1.7342
18	Use of school library centers for recreational reading will decline; print collections expanding primarily in informational rather than literary areas; use of more newspapers and magazines to update book collections.	1 14.6 2 18.5 3 25.2 4 15.2 5 18.5 nr 7.9	3.050	1.348	3.8294	'75 24.5 '80 19.9 '85 9.9 '90 9.3 '95 8.6 nr 27.8	2.413	1.383	11.3630*
19	Professional activities such as materials selection and processing being handled regionally.	1 19.9 2 17.2 3 15.9 4 9.3 5 29.1 nr 8.6	3.116	1.562	0.3446	'75 11.9 '80 19.9 '85 19.9 '90 11.9 '95 18.5 nr 17.9	3.065	1.372	1.1484
20	The school library media center will serve primarily as a resources "loaning" center supplying materials to support classroom instruction.	1 23.2 2 10.6 3 15.2 4 17.2 5 29.8 nr 4.0	3.207	1.572	1.9126	'75 45.0 '80 13.2 '85 6.0 '90 4.0 '95 8.6 nr 23.2	1.931	1.375	1.5232
21	Non-print materials will outrank print materials and will be better reviewed than at	1 9.9 2 13.2 3 35.1	3.223	1.246	2.1810	'75 11.3 '80 13.2 '85 23.8	3.161	1.352	4.0543

TABLE 1 - Continued

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
	present.	4 13.9 5 19.9 nr 7.9				'90 11.3 '95 18.5 nr 21.9			
22	Too little emphasis on quality of media placed in schools.	1 23.8 2 7.9 3 8.6 4 4.6 5 35.1 nr 19.9	3.223	1.751	2.2359	'75 35.1 '80 7.3 '85 6.6 '90 2.6 '95 9.3 nr 39.1	2.076	1.499	1.404
23	School library media specialists will be trained in colleges of education rather than in library schools.	1 14.6 2 17.2 3 12.6 4 13.9 5 37.1 nr 4.6	3.437	1.522	6.9641*	'75 12.6 '80 12.6 '85 14.6 '90 10.6 '95 25.2 nr 24.5	3.307	1.494	9.130
24	Emphasis will be on the performance of services for users as opposed to teaching the user to be self-sufficient.	1 12.6 2 12.6 3 25.2 4 17.9 5 27.2 nr 4.6	3.361	1.367	7.1644*	'75 11.3 '80 15.2 '85 20.5 '90 8.6 '95 20.5 nr 23.8	3.157	1.405	0.811
25	Decentralization of resources with satellite libraries arranged by subject or grade level.	1 2.6 2 14.6 3 19.9 4 21.2 5 39.7 nr 2.0	3.824	1.194	0.2590	'75 7.3 '80 13.9 '85 18.5 '90 16.6 '95 22.5 nr 21.2	3.420	1.318	3.081
26	Decline of financial support from all levels (federal, state, and local) will result in constriction of services, facilities, materials and staff.	1 10.6 2 6.6 3 9.9 4 9.3 5 49.7 nr 13.9	3.938	1.456	0.1952	'75 37.7 '80 12.6 '85 4.0 '90 5.3 '95 12.6 nr 27.8	2.202	1.556	3.096

TABLE 1 Continued

Rank	Trend	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
27	All school facilities in their present form will become obsolete as places for instruction are dispersed throughout the community.	1 7.3 2 4.0 3 13.9 4 19.2 5 53.0 nr 2.6	4.095	1.235	1.3900	'75 0.7 '80 4.6 '85 5.3 '90 11.3 '95 58.9 nr 19.2	4.516	0.947	2.2900
28	Decline in the number of professional positions as paraprofessionals replace professionals in the operation of media centers.	1 4.6 2 7.3 3 8.6 4 13.2 5 62.3 nr 4.0	4.262	1.190	0.2824	'75 13.9 '80 11.3 '85 17.9 '90 10.6 '95 22.5 nr 23.8	3.217	1.474	0.3387

NOTE: * The value of H exceeds that required for the .05 level.

TABLE 2

RANKING OF TRENDS BY PRACTITIONERS

Rank	Table 1#	Priority by Percent								Date by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1	1	77.6	12.2	4.1	2.0	4.1		1.429	0.979	44.9	24.5	16.3	10.2	—	4.1	1.915	1.039
2	3	65.3	22.4	10.2	---	---	2.0	1.437	0.681	46.9	36.7	8.2	--	--	8.2	1.578	0.657
3	5	65.3	20.4	10.2	---	2.0	2.0	1.500	0.851	32.7	32.7	20.4	4.1	2.0	8.2	2.022	0.988
4	2	67.3	20.4	4.1	2.0	6.1		1.592	1.098	30.6	32.7	18.4	8.2	2.0	8.2	2.111	1.049
5	4	55.1	26.5	12.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.667	0.930	46.9	26.5	10.2	4.1	4.1	8.2	1.822	1.093
6	6	49.0	16.3	22.4	6.1	4.1	2.0	1.979	1.176	20.4	16.3	24.5	16.3	14.3	8.2	2.867	1.375
7	14	32.7	26.5	26.5	10.2	2.0	2.0	2.208	1.091	18.4	18.4	30.6	6.1	14.3	12.2	2.767	1.324
8	12	32.7	26.5	26.5	4.1	6.1	4.1	2.213	1.160	26.5	16.3	24.5	10.2	12.2	10.2	2.614	1.385
9	10	40.8	26.5	8.2	12.2	10.2	2.0	2.229	1.387	18.4	26.5	20.4	8.2	14.3	12.2	2.698	1.355
10	9	38.8	20.4	26.5	4.1	10.2		2.265	1.303	30.6	22.4	18.4	8.2	10.2	10.2	2.386	1.351
11	8	34.7	30.6	14.3	8.2	10.2	2.0	2.271	1.317	26.5	34.7	18.4	10.2	2.0	8.2	2.200	1.057
12	11	34.7	20.4	26.5	10.2	6.1	2.0	2.312	1.240	22.4	22.4	30.6	8.2	4.1	12.2	2.419	1.118
13	7	32.7	30.6	16.3	6.1	12.2	2.0	2.333	1.342	34.7	22.4	18.4	6.1	2.0	16.3	2.024	1.084
14	16	34.7	18.4	26.5	10.2	8.2	2.0	2.375	1.299	8.2	34.7	24.5	10.2	10.2	12.2	2.767	1.151
15	17	34.7	12.2	32.7	10.2	8.2	2.0	2.437	1.303	12.2	14.3	32.7	12.2	14.3	14.3	3.024	1.259
16	15	26.5	18.4	22.4	16.3	14.3	2.0	2.729	1.410	4.1	14.3	22.4	22.4	26.5	10.2	3.591	1.207
17	13	24.5	14.3	36.7	10.2	14.3		2.755	1.331	8.2	20.4	20.4	10.2	30.6	10.2	3.386	1.401
18	22	28.6	8.2	14.3	6.1	26.5	16.3	2.927	1.694	32.7	10.2	8.2	2.0	8.2	38.8	2.067	1.437
19	20	30.6	8.2	20.4	14.3	26.5		2.980	1.601	49.0	12.2	4.1	6.1	12.2	16.3	2.049	1.516
20	18	10.2	24.5	22.4	16.3	22.4	4.1	3.170	1.340	22.4	20.4	10.2	10.2	12.2	24.5	2.595	1.462
21	23	18.4	20.4	10.2	22.4	26.5	2.0	3.187	1.511	18.4	10.2	10.2	12.2	22.4	26.5	3.139	1.606
22	19	20.4	18.4	14.3	10.2	34.7	2.0	3.208	1.597	14.3	20.4	16.3	14.3	18.4	16.3	3.024	1.423
23	21	10.2	16.3	30.6	20.4	20.4	2.0	3.250	1.263	12.2	12.2	26.5	10.2	14.3	24.5	3.027	1.323
24	24	10.2	8.2	34.7	18.4	26.5	2.0	3.437	1.270	14.3	12.2	26.5	2.0	18.4	26.5	2.972	1.424
25	25	4.1	12.2	22.4	20.4	40.8		3.816	1.219	10.2	10.2	18.4	18.4	24.5	18.4	3.450	1.377
26	26	10.2	6.1	12.2	8.2	53.1	10.2	3.977	1.438	28.6	14.3	4.1	12.2	12.2	28.6	2.514	1.579
27	27	8.2	2.0	8.2	24.5	57.1		4.204	1.207	---	4.1	4.1	8.2	67.3	16.3	4.659	0.794
28	28	2.0	6.1	10.2	16.3	63.3	2.0	4.354	1.041	12.2	12.2	20.4	12.2	20.4	22.4	3.211	1.417

TABLE 3

RANKING OF TRENDS BY OFFICERS

Rank	Table 1#	Priority by Percent								Date by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1	1	81.9	12.5	2.8	----	2.8		1.292	0.777	52.8	31.9	9.7	4.2	----	1.4	1.648	0.830
2	2	79.2	12.5	4.2	----	4.2		1.375	0 911	30.6	36.1	23.6	4.2	4.2	1.4	2.141	1.046
3	4	66.7	20.8	6.9	1.4	1.4	2.8	1.457	0.811	58.3	19.4	6.9	4.2	----	11.1	1.516	0.836
4	5	63.9	18.1	15.3	---	2.8		1.597	0.944	37.5	38.9	12.5	4.2	2.8	4.2	1.913	0.981
5	3	58.3	26.4	11.1	---	4.2		1.653	0.981	52.8	29.2	5.6	1.4	4.2	6.9	1.657	0.993
6	7	51.4	22.2	16.7	1.4	4.2	4.2	1.797	1.065	52.8	20.8	12.5	1.4	1.4	11..	1.625	0.900
7	8	50.0	25.0	15.3	4.2	4.2	1.4	1.859	1.099	41.7	29.2	11.1	---	5.6	12.5	1.841	1.081
8	6	47.2	25.0	19.4	5.6	2.8		1.917	1.071	20.8	37.5	20.8	13.9	2.8	4.2	2.377	1.072
9	10	43.1	34.7	9.7	5.6	5.6	1.4	1.944	1.132	19.4	36.1	22.2	6.9	6.9	8.3	2.409	1.136
10	9	52.8	15.3	16.7	2.8	12.5		2.069	1.397	36.1	22.2	18.1	4.2	12.5	6.9	2.299	1.382
11	13	37.5	31.9	19.4	4.2	5.6	1.4	2.070	1.125	13.9	30.6	19.4	12.5	18.1	5.6	2.897	1.351
12	12	41.7	20.8	25.0	4.2	5.6	2.8	2.086	1.176	31.9	33.3	9.7	6.9	4.2	13.9	2.048	1.122
13	11	38.9	27.8	22.2	2.8	6.9	1.4	2.099	1.173	37.5	26.4	19.4	2.8	2.8	11.1	1.953	1.030
14	15	27.8	34.7	16.7	9.7	8.3	2.8	2.343	1.238	8.3	13.9	36.1	18.1	11.1	12.5	3.111	1.123
15	14	30.6	22.2	22.2	11.1	6.9	6.9	2.373	1.265	29.2	20.8	15.3	2.8	6.9	25.0	2.167	1.255
16	16	36.1	11.1	19.4	11.1	20.8	1.4	2.690	1.573	18.1	20.8	26.4	9.7	9.7	15.3	2.672	1.261
17	17	27.8	15.3	25.0	12.5	18.1	1.4	2.775	1.456	9.7	26.4	22.2	12.5	15.3	13.9	2.968	1.280
18	18	20.8	13.9	27.8	13.9	12.5	11.1	2.812	1.344	31.9	22.2	9.7	8.3	1.4	26.4	1.981	1.101
19	21	9.7	12.5	43.1	12.5	13.9	8.3	3.091	1.147	12.5	16.7	23.6	12.5	16.7	18.1	3.051	1.345
20	19	18.1	18.1	15.3	6.9	27.8	13.9	3.097	1.565	9.7	23.6	20.8	8.3	16.7	20.8	2.982	1.329
21	20	25.0	9.7	6.9	18.1	31.9	8.3	3.242	1.665	44.4	12.5	6.9	2.8	4.2	29.2	1.725	1.168
22	23	15.3	18.1	12.5	11.1	34.7	8.3	3.348	1.554	13.9	15.3	18.1	8.3	19.4	25.0	3.056	1.459
23	22	20.8	11.1	4.2	4.2	40.3	19.4	3.397	1.767	38.9	5.6	5.6	4.2	6.9	38.9	1.932	1.437
24	24	12.5	11.1	16.7	18.1	34.7	6.9	3.552	1.438	12.5	13.9	12.5	9.7	23.6	27.8	3.250	1.519
25	25	1.4	15.3	18.1	20.8	40.3	4.2	3.870	1.175	8.3	13.9	20.8	18.1	15.3	23.6	3.236	1.276
26	26	11.1	6.9	8.3	12.5	47.2	13.9	3.903	1.468	43.1	8.3	4.2	2.8	11.1	30.6	2.000	1.525
27	27	5.6	4.2	16.7	15.3	52.8	5.6	4.118	1.204	----	4.2	4.2	13.9	54.2	23.6	4.545	0.835
28	28	4.2	9.7	6.9	13.9	58.3	6.9	4.209	1.225	13.9	13.9	13.9	8.3	22.2	27.8	3.154	1.526

TABLE 4

RANKING OF TRENDS BY PROFESSORS

Rank	Table 1#	Priority by Percent								Date by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1.5	2	66.7	23.3	—	3.3	6.7		1.600	1.133	16.7	36.7	30.0	10.0	6.7		2.533	1.106
1.5	3	70.0	13.3	10.0	—	6.7		1.600	1.133	30.0	33.3	20.0	3.3	10.0	3.3	2.276	1.251
3	1	76.7	10.0	—	—	13.3		1.633	1.377	40.0	20.0	30.0	3.3	6.7		2.167	1.206
4	6	60.0	10.0	20.0	—	3.3	6.7	1.679	1.056	16.7	23.3	30.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.704	1.235
5	7	53.3	13.3	26.7	3.3	—	3.3	1.793	0.978	50.0	20.0	20.0	—	3.3	6.7	1.786	1.031
6	5	46.7	26.7	13.3	—	6.7	6.7	1.857	1.146	26.7	33.3	26.7	—	6.7	6.7	2.214	1.101
7	4	60.0	10.0	16.7	10.0	3.3		1.867	1.224	43.3	16.7	16.7	10.0	10.0	3.3	2.241	1.405
8	15	36.7	36.7	13.3	10.0	3.3		2.067	1.112	3.3	30.0	33.3	13.3	16.7	3.3	3.103	1.145
9	11	36.7	23.3	33.3	6.7	—		2.100	0.995	10.0	53.3	20.0	6.7	10.0		2.533	1.106
10	9	43.3	16.7	26.7	6.7	6.7		2.167	1.262	13.3	50.0	23.3	6.7	3.3	3.3	2.345	0.936
11	13	36.7	23.3	20.0	16.7	—	3.3	2.172	1.136	6.7	23.3	16.7	20.0	23.3	10.0	3.333	1.330
12	8	36.7	23.3	26.7	3.3	6.7	3.3	2.172	1.197	36.7	23.3	23.3	10.0	3.3	3.3	2.172	1.167
13	12	20.0	40.0	26.7	10.0	3.3		2.367	1.033	23.3	40.0	20.0	6.7	6.7	3.3	2.310	1.137
14	10	33.3	26.7	13.3	6.7	20.0		2.533	1.525	10.0	30.0	23.3	6.7	20.0	10.0	2.963	1.344
15	14	30.0	13.3	23.3	20.0	13.3		2.733	1.437	23.3	23.3	10.0	10.0	16.7	16.7	2.680	1.520
16	24	16.7	23.3	30.0	16.7	10.0	3.3	2.793	1.236	3.3	23.3	30.0	16.7	16.7	10.0	3.222	1.155
17	19	23.3	13.3	20.0	13.3	23.3	6.7	3.000	1.540	13.3	10.0	23.3	16.7	23.3	13.3	3.308	1.408
18	17	10.0	23.3	26.7	20.0	13.3	6.7	3.036	1.232	3.3	16.7	40.0	6.7	23.3	10.0	3.333	1.177
19	16	16.7	16.7	20.0	13.3	33.3		3.300	1.512	3.3	20.0	26.7	6.7	26.7	16.7	3.400	1.291
20	18	6.7	20.0	23.3	16.7	26.7	6.7	3.393	1.315	10.0	13.3	10.0	10.0	20.0	36.7	3.236	1.522
21	22	23.3	—	10.0	3.3	36.7	26.7	3.409	1.817	30.0	6.7	6.7	—	16.7	40.0	2.444	1.756
22	20	6.7	16.7	26.7	20.0	30.0		3.500	1.280	40.0	16.7	6.7	3.3	13.3	20.0	2.167	1.523
23	21	10.0	10.0	23.3	6.7	33.3	16.7	3.520	1.447	6.7	6.7	20.0	10.0	30.0	26.7	3.682	1.359
24	25	3.3	16.7	20.0	23.3	36.7		3.733	1.230	—	20.0	13.3	10.0	36.7	20.0	3.792	1.285
25	27	10.0	6.7	16.7	20.0	46.7		3.867	1.358	3.3	6.7	10.0	10.0	56.7	13.3	4.231	1.306
26	26	10.0	6.7	10.0	3.3	50.0	20.0	3.958	1.517	40.0	20.0	3.3	—	16.7	20.0	2.167	1.579
27	23	6.7	10.0	16.7	6.7	60.0		4.033	1.351	—	10.0	13.3	13.3	43.3	20.0	4.125	1.116
28	28	10.0	3.3	10.0	6.7	70.0		4.233	1.357	16.7	3.3	23.3	13.3	26.7	16.7	3.360	1.497

NOTE: In the case of identical means, the item with the smaller deviation is ranked first.

self-sufficient. That professors rank trend 24 eight places higher than do members of the other groups may only reflect the old argument about maximum vs. minimum service. It may be, however, that a greater appreciation of reality tinctures the judgments of those in the field.

Professors, quite understandably, look with a more jaundiced eye than do other respondents on a trend (T.23) toward training school library media specialists in colleges of education rather than in library schools. In the case of trend 16, practitioners and officers give more importance than professors to providing all children's services, public as well as school, within media centers that would be open the year around. Job opportunities may be one explanation for the disparity in views. Trend 23 would curtail the number of library school positions open to professors; trend 16, on the other hand, would almost certainly increase job opportunities for members of the other two groups.

Two other trends would affect school library media specialists much the same as members of other professions are being affected. Accountability (T.7) narrowly missed having a significant H; it was, in fact, ranked higher by professors and officers than by practitioners. This trend toward accountability is not limited to those working in an educational setting. Nationally legislated peer review boards are already being established to insure accountability on the part of physicians. Accountability, whether viewed as desirable or undesirable, appears to be a trend that will affect several service oriented professions in the future.

All three groups agree on the undesirability of a trend (T.28) toward replacement of professionals by para-professionals. Such a trend is also becoming evident in other professions. In health services, for example, "nurse practitioners" and "paramedics" perform services formerly provided by physicians.

Tables 5-8 display the distribution of trends by priority and probable date of occurrence. In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest positions on the priority scale was used. In Table 5, for example, Trend 4 is placed at the 80th percentile indicating that at least 80 percent of all respondents rated that item high, either 1 or 2 on the priority scale. For date of occurrence, a cumulative percent of 75 was considered as consensus--ie., 75 percent or more respondent agreement on a probable date of occurrence for a given trend. To illustrate from Table 5, trend 4 appears in the middle time period (1985-1989) showing that at least 75 percent of the respondents believe that it will become common practice by the end of that time period. Trends 18, 22, and 26 lie outside the time cells of Table 5 because 25 percent or more of the respondents fail to make a judgment about their probable date of occurrence.

An analysis of the distribution of trends by priority and time makes clear that 75 percent or more of the respondents give a high priority rating to only five trends. Fifty percent or more of those responding rate an additional ten trends high. The earliest date of occurrence forecast for any of these high priority items is the middle period of the '80s. In contrast, all thirteen of the low priority items fall into the last time cell (1995-2000) or, in the case of three items, into the "no date" cell. Unless an effort is made to hasten their advent, it appears that the trends considered most desirable will not become practice as soon as members of the profession might wish. By the same token, the fact that the trends judged least desirable are forecast for a later time period permits plans being made to mitigate their effects.

An examination of Tables 6-8 discloses that the professors are more reluctant to assign a high priority rating to the trends than are the officers

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF TRENDS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--ALL GROUPS COMBINED

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early 1975-79	Middle 1980-84	Middle 1985-89	Late 1990-94	Late 1995-2000	nd
95						
90		1	2			
85		3				
80			4,5			
75						
70				6,10		
65			7,8			
60			9,11	12		
55					13,15	
50					14	
45					16	
40					17	
35					19,20	
30					23	18,22
25					24	
20					21	
15					25	26
10					27,28	

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF TRENDS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--PRACTITIONERS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early 1975-79	Middle 1980-84	Middle 1985-89	Late 1990-94	Late 1995-2000	nd
95						
90						
85		3	1,2,5			
80			4			
75						
70						
65			8	6	10	
60			7			
55			11	9,12	14	
50				16		
45					15,17	
40						
35					13,18,19,20	22,23
30						
25					21	
20						
15					25	24,26
10					27	
5					28	

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF TRENDS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--OFFICERS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early	Middle		Late		nd
	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-2000	
95						
90		1	2			
85		3,4				
80		5				
75			8,10			
70			6,7			
65			9,11	13		
60			12	15		
55						
50					14	
45				16		
40					17	
35					19	18,20
30					23	22
25						
20					21	24
15					25	26
10					27	28
5						

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF TRENDS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--PROFESSORS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early	Middle		Late		nd
	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-2000	
90			2			
85			1			
80			3			
75						
70			4,5	6,15		
65			7			
60			8,9,11,12		10,13	
55						
50						
45						
40					14,24	
35					19	
30					16,17	
25						18
20					20,25	21,22
15					23,26,27	
10					28	

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

and practitioners. Over all, however, the three groups agree in their evaluations. More than 50 percent of the officers give trends 1-15 a high rating; the professors omit only trend 14; the practitioners omit trends 13 and 15 but include trend 16. All three groups are cautious in forecasting probable date of occurrence. None assign a trend to the early time period; officers and practitioners assign four trends to the early-middle time period (1980-1984); professors make their earliest commitment to the late-middle period (1985-1989). The acceleration of change raises the possibility, however, that such estimates may be too conservative.

Findings--Innovations

One man's trend may be another man's innovation. In cases where an item was proposed as both a trend and an innovation, the decision was made to list it as a trend on the second questionnaire. Table 9 shows that the three respondent groups differ significantly in four of their estimates as to the desirability of the innovations. Comparing the statistic H for items 3, 4, 17, and 22 to the critical values of chi-square of 5.9 (.05 level) and 9.2 (.01 level) discloses a clear rejection at the .05 level and, in the case of items 3, 17, and 22, a rejection at the .01 level. Respondents evidently find forecasting the probable date of occurrence for innovations considerably chancier than making the same judgment for trends. Twelve of the date estimates differ significantly-- nine at the .01 level and three more at the .05 level.

Examining the top five items in Tables 10, 11, and 12 reveals that each group favors the use of multi-media in all library education courses (I.1) although they differ significantly in their estimations as to probable date of occurrence. Recruitment of personnel who can be communicators (I.2) and developing means to evaluate staff and services (I.3) also find favor with all three groups. In addition, professors and officers value requiring maximum

TABLE 9

INNOVATIONS RANKED ACCORDING TO PRIORITY BY THE MEAN FOR ALL GROUPS COMBINED

Rank	Innovations	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
1	Use of multi-media in all library education courses for teachers and library media specialists.	1 80.8 2 8.6 3 3.3 4 1.3 5 4.0 nr 2.0	1.358	0.933	1.5524	'75 43.0 '80 29.1 '85 11.3 '90 7.3 '95 2.6 nr 6.6	1.901	1.071	6.5772*
2	To insure more human relations with patrons, recruitment of personnel with the qualities needed to be communicators rather than merely locators and keepers of information.	1 79.5 2 8.6 3 4.0 4 1.3 5 4.0 nr 2.6	1.374	0.945	1.5607	'75 33.8 '80 31.8 '85 18.5 '90 3.3 '95 5.3 nr 7.3	2.079	1.106	2.5761
3	Development of standards and tools to make a valid evaluation of school library media services, resources, and staff and their effect on students and faculty.	1 64.9 2 21.9 3 5.3 4 2.6 5 2.6 nr 2.6	1.524	0.924	11.5806*	'75 33.1 '80 30.5 '85 21.9 '90 6.0 '95 2.0 nr 6.6	2.071	1.019	12.0948*
4	School media centers directed by professionally qualified (master's degree) library media specialists and not by personnel who meet minimum state requirements.	1 70.9 2 9.9 3 10.6 4 2.0 5 4.0 nr 2.6	1.544	1.042	6.3750*	'75 26.5 '80 29.8 '85 23.8 '90 5.3 '95 7.9 nr 6.6	2.340	1.194	9.5456*
5	School libraries designed with more private areas, student carrels, projection rooms, audio-tutorial areas, hardware built into the walls.	1 60.2 2 23.2 3 7.3 4 1.3 5 4.0 nr 4.0	1.600	0.989	2.7913	'75 28.5 '80 29.8 '85 23.8 '90 7.3 '95 2.0 nr 8.6	2.174	1.032	2.7723

TABLE 9 - Continued

Rank	Innovation	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
6	Curriculum development and subject area specialization made a major component of library training in order to prepare librarians for an expanded role as a school library media-curriculum specialist.	1 55.6 2 23.8 3 11.3 4 3.3 5 2.6 nr 3.3	1.692	0.994	2.9997	'75 26.5 '80 25.8 '85 29.1 '90 5.3 '95 5.3 nr 7.9	2.317	1.123	10.0036*
7	Uniform competency-based certification for school media personnel permitting easy mobility between states.	1 60.3 2 17.9 3 10.6 4 5.3 5 4.0 nr 2.0	1.723	1.112	1.6534	'75 15.9 '80 25.8 '85 24.5 '90 18.5 '95 7.9 nr 7.3	2.750	1.206	4.2724
8	Systematic needs and services assessment carried out by media specialists and faculty as a basis for program budget planning and management by objectives.	1 52.3 2 27.2 3 12.6 4 2.0 5 3.3 nr 2.6	1.735	0.995	5.3484	'75 24.5 '80 33.1 '85 24.5 '90 4.6 '95 6.6 nr 6.6	2.312	1.128	14.6439*
9	Standardized cataloging and preprocessing of all media from source (publisher, jobber) or federal, state, and municipal agencies.	1 53.0 2 24.5 3 11.9 4 3.3 5 3.3 nr 4.0	1.745	1.033	2.4754	'75 18.5 '80 21.9 '85 29.1 '90 11.9 '95 8.6 nr 9.9	2.669	1.217	6.9901*
10	Media center serving as learning resource center for all aspects of vocational and college exploration.	1 57.0 2 19.9 3 11.9 4 5.3 5 3.3 nr 2.6	1.748	1.084	0.8485	'75 32.5 '80 25.2 '85 19.2 '90 7.9 '95 5.3 nr 9.9	2.206	1.193	4.6488

TABLE 9 - Continued

Rank	Innovation	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
11	Circulation of all materials with simplified circulation procedure and borrowing privileges that extend media centers throughout the district and county.	1 55.0 2 14.6 3 15.2 4 8.6 5 3.3 nr 3.3	1.870	1.176	0.2211	'75 21.9 '80 21.9 '85 22.5 '90 13.2 '95 10.6 nr 9.9	2.654	1.313	4.8197
12	Every educator a media specialist -teachers required to take courses in library media center skills-selection, utilization, and subject reference.	1 55.6 2 15.2 3 14.6 4 6.6 5 5.3 nr 2.6	1.878	1.216	0.1363	'75 19.2 '80 19.9 '85 25.2 '90 15.9 '95 10.6 nr 9.3	2.766	1.291	5.6146
13	Nationwide standardization of non-print media and equipment.	1 53.6 2 17.2 3 14.6 4 4.0 5 7.3 nr 3.3	1.904	1.245	0.1197	'75 11.3 '80 25.8 '85 25.8 '90 11.3 '95 12.6 nr 13.2	2.863	1.233	3.3172
14	A district-level coordinator of in-service and continuing education designed for the school media specialist, paraprofessional, faculty member, and student aide.	1 41.7 2 23.8 3 21.2 4 4.6 5 6.0 nr 2.6	2.068	1.180	2.5752	'75 19.9 '80 19.9 '85 26.5 '90 12.6 '95 9.9 nr 11.3	2.694	1.276	2.9725
15	Library media specialists required to have two to three years of teaching experience to prepare them for the role of master teacher working in librarian-teacher teams, i.e., one media specialist per five teachers.	1 44.4 2 23.2 3 14.6 4 6.0 5 8.6 nr 3.3	2.082	1.289	1.8455	'75 13.9 '80 21.9 '85 21.9 '90 16.6 '95 11.9 nr 13.9	2.892	1.283	3.8738
16	Courses in information storage and retrieval and use of AV equip-	1 39.7 2 28.5	2.095	1.191	2.8156	'75 25.2 '80 17.9	2.550	1.219	11.5774*

TABLE 9 - Continued

Rank	Innovation	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
	ment and non-print media included in the secondary school curriculum.	3 16.6 4 7.3 5 6.0 nr 2.0				'85 28.5 '90 15.9 '95 5.3 nr 7.3			
17	Elimination of the present text book system in favor of a multi-choice library-oriented materials selection system based on inquiry methods and "hands-on" experiences for most subject areas.	1 45.0 2 23.2 3 13.2 4 8.6 5 7.9 nr 2.0	2.095	1.295	16.1636**	'75 15.2 '80 19.9 '85 25.2 '90 14.6 '95 15.9 nr 9.3	2.956	1.328	13.8306**
18	Regional centers sharing costs and facilities for the development, production, distribution, and utilization of instructional technology.	1 35.1 2 28.5 3 18.5 4 7.9 5 4.0 nr 6.0	2.120	1.133	4.8095	'75 13.9 '80 19.2 '85 27.8 '90 13.2 '95 13.2 nr 12.6	2.917	1.272	11.0688**
19	Regional materials selection centers based on a national evaluation center.	1 36.4 2 19.9 3 23.8 4 8.6 5 4.6 nr 6.6	2.199	1.197	2.6450	'75 12.6 '80 20.5 '85 24.5 '90 14.6 '95 12.6 nr 15.2	2.930	1.269	3.5701
20	Elimination of "skills" teaching to classes by librarians; functional instruction in locational skills taught as needed by classroom teachers and by programmed instruction on an individualized basis.	1 47.0 2 15.2 3 15.2 4 6.6 5 13.2 nr 2.6	2.218	1.450	2.1697	'75 31.1 '80 20.5 '85 21.2 '90 3.3 '95 10.6 nr 13.2	2.328	1.327	2.7057
21	Publishers providing all materials for "on-the-spot" reviewing by media specialsists.	1 33.8 2 25.2 3 16.6 4 6.6 5 10.6	2.300	1.334	2.8077	'75 10.6 '80 16.6 '85 29.8 '90 13.9 '95 11.9	3.000	1.212	2.4378

TABLE 9 - Continued

ank	Innovation	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
		nr 7.3				nr 17.2			
22	Use of media as report forms, term papers, etc.	1 36.4 2 19.2 3 16.6 4 9.3 5 11.3 nr 7.3	2.350	1.398	27.2930**	'75 29.1 '80 15.9 '85 19.2 '90 8.6 '95 12.6 nr 14.6	2.527	1.426	19.2080**
3	The library media center as the cultural center of the school-planned purchases of art prints, sculpture; sponsorship of dance, art, and music programs; employment of artists, dancers, and authors for special minicourses.	1 35.1 2 19.9 3 21.9 4 9.9 5 10.6 nr 2.6	2.395	1.353	2.7469	'75 13.9 '80 16.6 '85 21.9 '90 15.2 '95 20.5 nr 11.9	3.135	1.386	10.1017**
4	Development of standardized plans for library media centers that could be made available to architects.	1 38.4 2 17.2 3 13.9 4 7.3 5 19.9 nr 3.3	2.514	1.564	3.6092	'75 16.6 '80 18.5 '85 19.9 '90 10.6 '95 18.5 nr 15.9	2.953	1.425	7.9190*
5	Development of criteria useful in the selection of student assistants and the evaluation of their work.	1 30.5 2 19.9 3 23.2 4 9.9 5 14.6 nr 2.0	2.574	1.405	2.0056	'75 23.1 '80 19.2 '85 21.2 '90 5.3 '95 10.6 nr 14.6	2.403	1.344	2.6324
6	Giveaway programs of paperbacks, pamphlets, and inexpensive cassette tapes.	1 27.2 2 19.2 3 23.2 4 12.2 5 11.3 nr 6.6	2.589	1.353	2.7389	'75 12.6 '80 17.9 '85 21.2 '90 16.6 '95 17.9 nr 13.9	3.108	1.348	5.6347

TABLE 9 - Continued

Rank	Innovation	Priority by %	Mean	S.D.	H	Date by %	Mean	S.D.	H
27	Student use of computer assisted interrogation system that ascertains student needs and retrieves information from community, state, and national data banks.	1 22.5 2 21.2 3 29.1 4 13.2 5 10.6 nr 3.3	2.671	1.276	2.6244	'75 5.3 '80 13.2 '85 22.5 '90 21.2 '95 27.8 nr 9.9	3.588	1.232	2.5825
28	The development of SDI (selective) distribution of information, including profiling) for students as well as teachers.	1 13.9 2 17.2 3 33.8 4 13.2 5 11.3 nr 10.6	2.896	1.211	1.2845	'75 8.6 '80 10.6 '85 18.5 '90 23.2 '95 20.5 nr 18.5	3.447	1.288	1.4713
29	Guidance personnel stationed in the media center.	1 16.6 2 15.9 3 21.2 4 13.2 5 25.8 nr 7.3	3.171	1.459	3.3276	'75 6.0 '80 11.3 '85 17.9 '90 15.9 '95 25.8 nr 23.2	3.578	1.300	2.2234

NOTE: * The value of H exceeds that required for the .05 level.

** The value of H exceeds that required for the .01 level.

TABLE 10

RANKING OF INNOVATIONS BY PRACTITIONERS

Rank	Table 9#	Priority by Percent								Date by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1	1	85.7	4.1	4.1	---	4.1	2.0	1.292	0.898	51.0	30.6	4.1	4.1	2.0	8.2	1.644	0.933
2	5	69.4	24.5	4.1	---	2.0		1.408	0.762	36.7	26.5	18.4	12.2	---	6.1	2.065	1.063
3	2	75.5	10.2	8.2	---	4.1	2.0	1.437	0.965	32.7	30.6	22.4	4.1	2.0	8.2	2.044	0.999
4	7	59.2	20.4	10.2	6.1	2.0	2.0	1.687	1.035	20.4	12.2	28.6	22.4	6.1	10.2	2.795	1.250
5	3	44.9	32.7	12.2	2.0	2.0	6.1	1.761	0.923	24.5	34.7	12.2	12.2	2.0	14.3	2.214	1.094
6	6	44.9	26.5	18.4	2.0	2.0	6.1	1.826	0.973	16.3	20.4	40.8	8.2	2.0	12.2	2.535	0.984
7	12	57.1	16.3	14.3	4.1	6.1	2.0	1.833	1.209	22.4	26.5	14.3	18.4	4.1	14.3	2.476	1.234
8	10	55.1	18.4	14.3	4.1	6.1	2.0	1.854	1.203	32.7	20.4	20.4	6.1	8.2	12.2	2.279	1.297
9	4	59.2	10.2	18.4	4.1	6.1	2.0	1.854	1.238	26.5	22.4	26.5	10.2	4.1	10.2	2.364	1.163
10	9	46.9	26.5	16.3	4.1	4.1	2.0	1.896	1.096	16.3	12.2	34.7	12.2	12.2	12.2	2.907	1.269
11	11	57.1	16.3	10.2	12.2	4.1		1.898	1.246	28.6	22.4	18.4	8.2	12.2	10.2	2.477	1.389
12	21	38.8	24.5	18.4	6.1	2.0	10.2	1.977	1.067	8.2	14.3	32.7	18.4	6.1	20.4	3.000	1.076
13	13	55.1	14.3	18.4	2.0	10.2		1.980	1.331	10.2	20.4	26.5	16.3	14.3	12.2	3.047	1.253
14	16	53.1	14.3	18.4	8.2	6.1		2.000	1.275	28.6	24.5	22.4	12.2	4.1	8.2	2.333	1.187
15	8	42.9	24.5	20.4	---	8.2	4.1	2.021	1.207	24.5	22.4	26.5	4.1	14.3	8.2	2.578	1.357
16	14	38.8	28.6	20.4	4.1	6.1	2.0	2.083	1.164	18.4	24.5	22.4	12.2	6.1	16.3	2.561	1.205
17	24	44.9	20.4	20.4	6.1	8.2		2.122	1.285	18.4	16.3	24.5	16.3	10.2	14.3	2.810	1.311
18	15	40.8	20.4	14.3	8.2	14.3	2.0	2.333	1.464	12.2	14.3	20.4	22.4	14.3	16.3	3.146	1.315
19	18	28.6	24.5	26.5	14.3	4.1	2.0	2.396	1.180	8.2	14.3	24.5	24.5	14.3	14.3	3.262	1.211
20	25	32.7	20.4	26.5	6.1	12.2	2.0	2.437	1.351	32.7	18.4	24.5	2.0	10.2	12.2	2.302	1.319
21	19	28.6	26.5	18.4	14.3	8.2	4.1	2.447	1.299	14.3	12.2	30.6	8.2	16.3	18.4	3.000	1.340
22	20	40.8	18.4	10.2	14.3	16.3		2.469	1.542	32.7	16.3	22.4	2.0	10.2	16.3	2.293	1.346
23	23	36.7	18.4	14.3	16.3	12.2	2.0	2.479	1.458	12.2	18.4	16.3	14.3	24.5	14.3	3.238	1.445
24	26	20.4	22.4	26.5	14.3	10.2	6.1	2.696	1.280	10.2	12.2	28.6	16.3	18.4	14.3	3.238	1.284
25	17	28.6	20.4	16.3	16.3	18.4		2.755	1.493	4.1	16.3	18.4	20.4	26.5	14.3	3.571	1.252
26	27	16.3	22.4	30.6	14.3	16.3		2.918	1.304	6.1	12.2	18.4	18.4	32.7	12.2	3.674	1.304
27	28	16.3	12.2	30.6	18.4	12.2	10.2	2.977	1.285	14.3	6.1	18.4	20.4	18.4	22.4	3.289	1.412
28	29	20.4	12.2	20.4	16.3	26.5	4.1	3.170	1.508	6.1	10.2	12.2	18.4	30.6	22.4	3.737	1.329
29	22	16.3	16.3	20.4	14.3	28.6	4.1	3.234	1.478	12.2	14.3	20.4	14.3	22.4	16.3	3.244	1.410

TABLE 11

RANKING OF INNOVATIONS BY OFFICERS

Rank	Table 9#	Priority by Percent								Priority by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1	1	80.6	9.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	1.4	1.352	0.896	44.4	26.4	16.7	8.3	---	4.2	1.884	0.993
2	4	77.8	11.1	6.9	---	2.8	1.4	1.366	0.849	34.7	33.3	20.8	1.4	6.9	2.8	2.100	1.131
3	2	80.6	9.7	2.8	1.4	4.2	1.4	1.366	0.945	37.5	34.7	15.3	2.8	4.2	5.6	1.956	1.043
4	3	70.8	20.8	2.8	2.8	2.8		1.458	0.903	45.8	29.2	19.4	1.4	1.4	2.8	1.800	0.910
5	8	59.7	29.2	8.3	---	1.4	1.4	1.521	0.772	30.6	43.1	18.1	2.8	---	5.6	1.926	0.798
6	6	62.5	23.6	8.3	1.4	2.8	1.4	1.563	0.922	36.1	30.6	18.1	2.8	5.6	6.9	2.045	1.121
7	9	58.3	20.8	11.1	1.4	2.8	5.6	1.618	0.962	26.4	26.4	19.4	11.1	6.9	9.7	2.400	1.247
8	10	55.6	22.2	11.1	5.6	2.8	2.8	1.743	1.059	37.5	27.8	13.9	9.7	1.4	9.7	2.000	1.075
9	5	52.8	23.6	9.7	1.4	5.6	6.9	1.746	1.106	27.8	27.8	27.8	2.8	1.4	12.5	2.111	0.952
10	17	52.8	23.6	15.3	2.8	4.2	1.4	1.803	1.077	25.0	20.8	26.4	12.5	9.7	5.6	2.588	1.296
11	7	56.9	18.1	13.9	5.6	4.2	1.4	1.803	1.142	16.7	36.1	22.2	12.5	8.3	4.2	2.580	1.181
12	22	52.8	13.9	13.9	5.6	4.2	9.7	1.831	1.180	44.4	13.9	13.9	5.6	6.9	15.3	2.016	1.310
13	13	52.8	19.4	12.5	5.6	5.6	4.2	1.870	1.199	15.3	29.2	19.4	9.7	11.1	15.3	2.672	1.274
14	11	51.4	15.3	19.4	4.2	4.2	5.6	1.882	1.153	22.2	23.6	22.2	9.7	11.1	11.1	2.594	1.318
15	12	54.2	15.3	15.3	6.9	5.6	2.8	1.914	1.236	23.6	15.3	29.2	12.5	13.9	5.6	2.765	1.362
16	18	36.1	36.1	13.9	1.4	4.2	8.3	1.924	1.012	19.4	25.0	27.8	6.9	8.3	12.5	2.540	1.202
17	15	50.0	19.4	16.7	4.2	6.9	2.8	1.957	1.233	19.4	23.6	19.4	16.7	8.3	12.5	2.667	1.283
18	19	40.3	15.3	27.8	2.8	4.2	9.7	2.062	1.144	15.3	25.0	19.4	13.9	9.7	16.7	2.733	1.274
19	16	37.5	36.1	11.1	8.3	5.6	1.4	2.070	1.163	30.6	16.7	27.8	18.1	1.4	5.6	2.397	1.174
20	20	50.0	15.3	18.1	2.8	12.5	1.4	2.113	1.399	37.5	20.8	15.3	5.6	11.1	9.7	2.246	1.381
21	14	37.5	25.0	22.2	5.6	6.9	2.8	2.171	1.215	26.4	13.9	27.8	12.5	9.7	9.7	2.615	1.331
22	23	40.3	18.1	25.0	4.2	9.7	2.8	2.229	1.310	19.4	18.1	26.4	13.9	12.5	9.7	2.800	1.325
23	21	34.7	19.4	13.9	8.3	18.1	5.6	2.529	1.530	16.7	16.7	26.4	8.3	15.3	16.7	2.867	1.359
24	25	31.9	22.2	18.1	12.5	13.9	1.4	2.535	1.423	29.2	22.2	15.3	6.9	8.3	18.1	2.305	1.316
25	27	26.4	19.4	27.8	12.5	9.7	4.2	2.580	1.299	6.9	15.3	25.0	19.4	23.6	9.7	3.415	1.261
26	26	25.0	18.1	25.0	9.7	13.9	8.3	2.667	1.385	16.7	23.6	18.1	12.5	15.3	13.9	2.839	1.381
27	24	36.1	12.5	11.1	5.6	29.2	5.6	2.779	1.718	20.8	20.8	15.3	8.3	16.7	18.1	2.746	1.469
28	28	9.7	19.4	36.1	11.1	11.1	12.5	2.937	1.148	6.9	12.5	19.4	20.8	19.4	20.8	3.421	1.267
29	29	12.5	16.7	20.8	12.5	30.6	6.9	3.343	1.441	6.9	12.5	19.4	18.1	19.4	23.6	3.400	1.285

TABLE 12

RANKING OF INNOVATIONS BY PROFESSORS

Rank	Table 9#	Priority by Percent								Date by Percent							
		1	2	3	4	5	nr	Mean	S.D.	'75	'80	'85	'90	'95	nr	Mean	S.D.
1	2	83.3	3.3	---	3.3	3.3	6.7	1.286	0.937	26.7	26.7	20.0	3.3	13.3	10.0	2.444	1.368
2	3	83.3	6.7	---	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.310	0.930	16.7	26.7	43.3	6.7	3.3	3.3	2.517	0.986
3	4	73.3	6.7	6.7	3.3	3.3	6.7	1.464	1.036	6.7	33.3	26.7	6.7	16.7	10.0	2.926	1.238
4	1	73.3	13.3	3.3	---	6.7	3.3	1.483	1.090	26.7	33.3	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	2.370	1.334
5	10	63.3	16.7	10.0	6.7	---	3.3	1.586	0.946	20.0	26.7	30.0	6.7	10.0	6.7	2.571	1.230
6	5	63.3	20.0	6.7	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.586	1.018	16.7	40.0	23.3	10.0	6.7	3.3	2.483	1.122
7	7	70.0	13.3	3.3	3.3	6.7	3.3	1.586	1.181	6.7	23.3	23.3	26.7	10.0	10.0	3.111	1.155
8	17	53.3	26.7	3.3	10.0	---	6.7	1.679	0.983	10.0	23.3	33.3	10.0	13.3	10.0	2.926	1.207
9	8	50.0	26.7	10.0	10.0	---	3.3	1.793	1.013	10.0	26.7	36.7	10.0	10.0	6.7	2.821	1.124
10	9	50.0	30.0	6.7	6.7	3.3	3.3	1.793	1.082	3.3	26.7	43.3	13.3	6.7	6.7	2.929	0.940
11	14	56.7	13.3	20.0	3.3	3.3	3.3	1.793	1.114	6.7	26.7	30.0	13.3	16.7	6.7	3.071	1.215
12	11	60.0	10.0	13.3	13.3	---	3.3	1.793	1.146	10.0	16.7	30.0	30.0	6.7	6.7	3.071	1.120
13	6	56.7	20.0	6.7	10.0	3.3	3.3	1.793	1.177	20.0	23.3	36.7	6.7	10.0	3.3	2.621	1.208
14	13	53.3	16.7	13.3	3.3	6.7	6.7	1.857	1.239	3.3	26.7	40.0	6.7	13.3	10.0	3.000	1.074
15	12	56.7	13.3	13.3	10.0	3.3	3.3	1.862	1.217	3.3	20.0	33.3	20.0	13.3	10.0	3.222	1.086
16	15	36.7	36.7	10.0	6.7	3.3	6.7	1.964	1.071	3.3	30.0	30.0	6.7	16.7	13.3	3.038	1.183
17	20	50.0	10.0	16.7	3.3	10.0	10.0	2.037	1.400	13.3	26.7	33.3	---	10.0	16.7	2.600	1.155
18	22	30.0	36.7	16.7	10.0	---	6.7	2.071	0.979	20.0	23.3	30.0	6.7	10.0	10.0	2.593	1.248
19	19	40.0	20.0	23.3	13.3	---	3.3	2.103	1.113	3.3	23.3	26.7	26.7	13.3	6.7	3.250	1.110
20	18	43.3	16.7	16.7	13.3	3.3	6.7	2.107	1.257	10.0	13.3	33.3	10.0	23.3	10.0	3.259	1.318
21	26	43.3	16.7	13.3	16.7	6.7	3.3	2.241	1.380	6.7	13.3	16.7	26.7	23.3	13.3	3.538	1.272
22	21	23.3	40.0	20.0	3.3	6.7	6.7	2.250	1.110	---	20.0	33.3	20.0	13.3	13.3	3.308	1.011
23	16	23.3	33.3	26.7	3.3	6.7	6.7	2.321	1.124	6.7	10.0	40.0	16.7	16.7	10.0	3.296	1.137
24	27	23.3	23.3	30.0	13.3	3.3	6.7	2.464	1.138	---	10.0	23.3	30.0	30.0	6.7	3.857	1.008
25	24	33.3	23.3	10.0	13.3	16.7	3.3	2.552	1.526	3.3	16.7	23.3	6.7	36.7	13.3	3.654	1.325
26	23	20.0	26.7	26.7	13.3	10.0	3.3	2.655	1.261	3.3	10.0	20.0	20.0	33.3	13.3	3.808	1.201
27	28	20.0	20.0	33.3	10.0	10.0	6.7	2.679	1.249	3.3	13.3	16.7	33.3	26.7	6.7	3.714	1.150
28	29	20.0	20.0	23.3	10.0	13.3	13.3	2.731	1.373	3.3	10.0	23.3	6.7	33.3	23.3	3.739	1.287
29	25	23.3	13.3	30.0	10.0	20.0	3.3	2.897	1.448	23.3	13.3	30.0	6.7	16.7	10.0	2.778	1.423

rather than minimum professional preparation (I.4); practitioners, some of whom may meet only minimum standards, do not include that item in their first five.

Few are interested in stationing guidance personnel in the library media center(I.29). Respondents are equally unenthusiastic about providing selective distribution of information to students (I.28). Although these are the only items that appear in the last five rankings of each of the three groups, student use of computor interrogation systems (I.27) and standardized plans for school library media centers (I.24) appear in the last five ranks of two groups. Unlike their ratings for the trends, the groups do not agree on the innovation they consider least desirable.

Table 13 displays the distribution of innovations by the priority and time ratings given each item by all three groups combined. Tables 14-16 provide individual group distributions. As in the distributions for trends, the priority rating indicates what percent of the respondents assign an item a high rating of 1 or 2. The time rating indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an innovation will become common practice. For example, Table 13 reveals that the innovation ranked first by all three groups combined receives a high rating of 1 or 2 from 85 percent or more of all respondents; 75 percent or more of them believe that the use of multi-media in all library education courses for teachers and library media specialists will become common practice during the late-middle (1985-1989) time period. Practitioners and officers place that item at the 90th percentile; professors place it at the 85th. The three groups differ significantly, however, in their time estimations. Practitioners estimate that multi-media will be used in all library education courses by 1980-1984; officers forecast 1985-1989; professors pick 1990-1994. All agree that this is a desirable innovation but the practitioners who probably

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF INNOVATIONS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--ALL GROUPS COMBINED

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence				
	Early	Middle			Late
	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-2000
95					
90					
85			1,2,3		
80			4,5,8		
75			6,10	7,9	
70				11,12	13
65				14,16,17	15
60				20	18
55					19,21,22,23,24
50				25	
45					26
40					27
35					
30					28,29
25					
20					
15					
10					

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF INNOVATIONS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--PRACTITIONERS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early 1975-79	Middle 1980-84	Middle 1985-89	Late 1990-94	Late 1995-2000	nd
95						
90		1	5			
85			2			
80				7		
75				3		
70			6	9,10,11,12		
65			4,16	8,14,24,		
60					13 21,15	
55					19,20,23	
50			25		18	
45					17	
40					26	
35					27	
30					22,29	
25					28	
20						
15						
10						
5						

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF INNOVATIONS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--OFFICERS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early	Middle		Late		nd
	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-2000	
95						
90		3	1,2			
85			4,6,8			
80						
75			5,7,10	9,17		
70			16	12,18	13	
65				11,15,20,22		
60				14		
55				23	19	
50					21,25	
45					24,27	
40					26	
35						
30						
25					28,29	
20						
15						
10						
5						

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF INNOVATIONS BY PRIORITY AND TIME--PROFESSORS

Priority by Cumulative Percent	Probable Date of Occurrence					
	Early	Middle		Late		nd
	1975-79	1980-84	1985-89	1990-94	1995-2000	
95						
90			3			
85				1,2		
80			5,10	7,9,17	4	
75			6	8		
70				11,12,13,14	15	
65				22		
60				19	18,20,21,26	
55					16,24	
50						
45					23,27	
40					28,29	
35					25	
30						
25						
20						
15						
10						
5						

NOTE: In the case of priority, the cumulative frequency for the two highest (1 and 2) positions on the priority scale were used.

The probable date of occurrence indicates the period in which 75 percent or more of the respondents believe an item will become common practice.

best realize the need for such courses are more optimistic in their time estimates than are the professors who will be offering the courses.

Officers and professors assign a high priority rating to twice as many innovations as do the practitioners who give a more conservative rating to the majority of the proposed innovations. Two innovations (I.1 and I.3) are forecast for the early-middle period (1980-1984) by practitioners and officers respectively. The data in table 13 indicates, however, that the late-middle time period (1985-1989) is the earliest date forecast by all groups combined for those innovations considered most desirable.

Summary and Conclusions

Practitioners, officers, and professors agree, for the most part, in their estimations as to the desirability of each trend and innovation differing significantly on only four of the twenty-eight trends and on only four of the twenty-nine innovations. Judgments about the probable date of occurrence of the trends and innovations are at greater variance than those for priority. The groups differ significantly on time estimations for five of the trends and twelve of the innovations.

This study has implications for all those concerned with school library media centers. More specifically, it has implications for practitioners, officers and leaders in the profession, and professors charged with providing the formal preparation for school library media specialists.

The implications for practitioners appear awesome. A school library media specialist who can meet the expectations set forth in these trends and innovations will be the most important member of the school staff able to do anything a teacher can do and most of what an administrator must do. To achieve these trends and innovations, however, will require a more forceful approach than has been charac-

teristic of many professionals in the past.

If library educators are to meet the needs of those who will be functioning as school library media specialists, library schools will have to provide a much more media oriented course of studies than is now offered in many programs. Library schools will have to require their students to cross disciplinary lines to take education courses that will make them knowledgeable about the curriculum, individualized learning, and the myriad things they will have to know in order to take their proper place on the educational team. Less autonomous library programs such as those that are part of a college of education may be at an advantage in this interdisciplinary effort.

Officers and leaders of the profession may face the greatest challenge of all. Theirs is the responsibility to lead the practitioners and to push the professors. They must lead those in the field to revise their philosophies and to update their skills in order to meet the needs of the future. They must push the professors to revise their philosophies and to update their courses to meet the needs of aspirants to the profession as well as established members interested in continuing education.

Emerson wrote that "the project of innovation is the best possible state of things." This study indicates that members of the profession think that sufficient time exists to promote desirable trends and innovations and to circumvent the ones considered less desirable. Those entrusted with the future of school library media centers may never achieve that best possible state, but with sound planning they can achieve a better state.

REFERENCES

1. Stone, Elizabeth. Training for the Improvement of Library Administration. Univ. of Illinois Graduate School of Library Science Monograph Series, 1967.

2. Bell, Daniel. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

3. Helmer, Olaf. Social Technology. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

4. American Library Association. Membership Directory 1973. Chicago: A.L.A.
American Library Association. ALA Handbook of Organization 1973-74. Chicago: A.L.A.
Association of American Library Schools. Directory of the Association of American Library Schools. Special edition of the Journal of Education for Librarianship, 1972.

5. Hays, William L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.